



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,597	07/30/2003	Beatrice Martin	Q76502	6211
23373 7590 04/15/2010				
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC				
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800				
WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
IBRAHIM, MOHAMED				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2444				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/15/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* BEATRICE MARTIN and JAQUES COUET

---

Appeal 2009-011586  
Application 10/629,597  
Technology Center 2400

---

Mailed: April 15, 2010

---

Before DALE M. SHAW, *Division 2 Support Administrator*

ORDER REMANDING APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received at the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on June 8, 2009. A Docketing Notice was mailed and Appeal No 2009-011586 was assigned on June 12, 2009. A review of the application has revealed that the application was not ready for an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being remanded to the Examiner. The matter requiring attention is identified below.

Claims 1 of the instant application contains functional language that may be indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. *See Ex Parte Rodriguez*, 2009 WL 3756279 (BPAI 2009) and *Aristocrat Techs. Austl. Pty. Ltd. v. H'l. Game Tech.*, 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed Cir. 2008). On September 2, 2008 the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examination Policy, John J. Love, issued a memorandum entitled “Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, when examining means (or step) plus function claim limitations under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph”, located at: [http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/section\\_112\\_6th\\_09\\_02\\_2008.pdf](http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/section_112_6th_09_02_2008.pdf) . Thus, there is a question as to whether claim 1 and the claims which depend upon this claim, meet the requirements of being definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is remanded to the Examiner to determine if claim 1 and the claims which depend upon this claim, meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

If there are any questions pertaining to this order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

DMS/eld

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037